

Bankstahl, Herbert A.

S/N: 10/711,475

REMARKS

Claims 1-109 are pending in the present application. In the Office Action of November 23, 2005, the Examiner withdrew from consideration claims 16-105 and 109 as deemed drawn to a non-elected invention. Applicant has filed concurrently herewith a Request for Supervisory Review of the restriction requirement of August 11, 2005.

In the Office Action mailed November 23, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-7, 11-12 and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Stevens, Jr. (USP 2,742,622). The Examiner next rejected claims 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevens in view of Double (USP 3,736,548). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevens in view of Double and further in view of Pope (USP 3,297,975). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevens in view of Double, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Lecocq (USP 3,491,329). Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevens in view of Double, as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Cusick et al. (EP 241121A2). Claims 106-108 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lecocq.

In the first paragraph of the Office Action of November 23, 2005 the Examiner states that "Applicant's amendment of October 6, 2005 is acknowledged" and that "it is noted that specie 2 (group D)(Figures 2C and 2D), claims 1-15, 19-22, 24-37,61-67,70-81, 85-96,99 and 101-108 has been selected." Applicant did not file a submission on October 6, 2005 nor does the present application include a Figure 2C or a Figure 2D. Applicant has filed concurrently herewith a Petition requesting review of the restriction and election with traverse filed September 12, 2005.

Addressing the restriction, the Examiner objected to the drawings stating that "the subject matter of this application admits of illustration by drawing to facilitate understanding of the invention" and that "Applicant is required to furnish the drawings for species 3-8." Not only has the Examiner apparently disregarded Applicant's remarks in the Response of September 12, 2005 with respect to the fact that "claims are never species" as stated in MPEP §806.04(e), but now the Examiner requires Applicant to submit additional drawings for that which is already shown in the pending drawings and for claims the Examiner has withdrawn from consideration. However, that which is called for in all of the originally filed claims, is indeed shown in the drawings as filed.

Bankstahl, Herbert A.

S/N: 10/711,475

The Examiner states that "specie 2 (Figures 13-17), [is deemed drawn to] claims 115 and/or 106-108"; that "specie 3 (No Figure (see page 17, [Para 56]), [is deemed drawn to] claims 19-41; and that "species 2 does not have a device adapter." Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, claim 8, included in "species 2" further defines the connector assembly of claim 1 as being incorporated into a welding-type device wherein the first connector is attached to a welding cable and *the second connector is rigidly attached to the welding-type device*. That is, the second connector adapts the welding-type device to connect to the welding cable. The device adapter called for in claim 19 is defined in the claim as being constructed to engage a welding device end of a cable adapter and comprising a body having a first end and a second end, a recess extending into the body from the first end, a threaded section formed in the recess proximate the first end, and a smooth section formed in the recess between the threaded section and the second end.

Referring to Fig. 3 of alleged "species 1", device adapter 42 shown therein is constructed to engage the welding device end 56 of a cable adapter 44. Device adapter 42 has a recess 98 which extends into the body of the device adapter from a first end. A threaded section 108 is formed in recess 98 proximate the first end. A smooth section 102 is formed in recess 98 between the threaded section 108 and a second end of the body. Comparatively, Fig. 13 of "species 2" also shows a device adapter 174 constructed to engage a welding device end 204 of a cable adapter 172. Device adapter 174 has a recess 190 which extends into the body of the device adapter from a first end. A threaded section 196 is formed in recess 190 proximate the first end and a smooth section 198 is formed in recess 190 between threaded section 196 and a second end of the body. Therefore, it is clear that the alleged "species 1" and "species 2" actually include the elements which the Examiner maintains forms "species 3" but also states is not illustrated. The Examiners' literal comparison of that which is called for in the claims to the drawings cannot not support an assertion that that which is called for in the present claims is not shown in the drawings. Regardless of the Examiner's unsupportable "claims as species" interpretation, as set forth above, that which is called for in the claims is indeed shown in the drawings as associated with each of the disclosed embodiments as set forth in the Specification. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Substantively, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-7, 11-12, and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Stevens stating that "in regards to claim 1, Stevens

Bankstahl, Herbert A.

S/N: 10/711,475

discloses a high-power quick connector assembly comprising a first connector (12) having a stem portion (36) and a collar portion (18) (figure 5) connectable to a cable (16), the stem portion (36) having a shank end (of 30) and a threaded end (40, 42); and a second connector (10) having a recess (formed inside 62) formed therein, the recess (formed inside 62) constructed to receive the stem portion (30) of the first connector (12) and engage the shank end (of 30) and the threaded end (40, 42) (figure 1).”

Applicant has amended claim 1 for clarification.

In order to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach each and every element of the claim. MPEP 2131. Claim 1 calls for, in part, a high-power quick connector assembly having a first connector which has a stem portion having a shank segment extending an axial length of the stem portion and a threaded segment. Claim 1 further calls for the recess in the second connector constructed to receive the stem portion of the first connector and engage the shank segment and the threaded segment. Referring to all the figures, Stevens states that “the male coupling element 18 ... includes a cylindrical portion 28, and a reduced diameter portion at 30.” Col.2, lns. 31-34. As shown in Figs. 2 and 3, the entire outer surface of the reduced diameter portion 30 of male coupling element 18 which engages the corresponding recess of the second coupling element 24 is threaded. That is, the connector assembly of Stevens does not include a shank segment which extends an axial length of the stem portion and a threaded segment wherein both the shank segment and the threaded segment are received in a recess of the second connector and engaged thereby. As such, Stevens does not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant believes claim 1, and the claims that depend therefrom, are patentably distinct thereover.

The Examiner rejected claims 106-108 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lecocq. However, in addressing the subject matter of claims 107 and 108, the Examiner alleges that the elements called for in these claims is disclosed in Stevens. It is unclear whether claims 106-108 have been rejected as unpatentable over Lecocq, over Stevens, or over some combination thereof. Accordingly, the Office Action of November 23, 2005 is incomplete inasmuch as the Examiner has rejected claims 106-108 over one reference but applied a different reference to support the rejection. Should the Examiner find that the claims as presented herein are not in condition for allowance, Applicant request a subsequent non-final office action clarifying the rejection.

Bankstahl, Herbert A.

S/N: 10/711,475

Notwithstanding the ambiguity of the Examiner's rejection, Applicant has amended claims 106 for clarification. As amended, claim 106 calls for, in part, a quick connector assembly having a first connector electrically connectable to a second connector and securable thereto upon rotation of one of the first connector and the second connector relative to the other of the first connector and the second connector. Lococq discloses a connector assembly wherein a plug 18 is slidably received in a socket member 24. Rotation of either plug 18 or socket member 24 does not electrically connect the respective members. Rotation of actuating handle 76 displaces pressure plate 36 thereby compressing the sleeve portions 32 about prong 20 of plug 18. That is, regardless of the rotational relationship of prong 20 to socket member 24, the electrical connection is not secured until the rotation of the actuation handle 76. Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to rotationally associate the plug and socket members of the connector assembly of Lecocq to form the connection between the parts thereof. That is, one of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate that prong 20 is constructed to fit snugly within socket member 24 and providing a construction which requires a rotational association therebetween would negate the compressive nature of the connector assembly thereof. As such, Applicant believes claims 106, and the claims that depend therefrom, are patentably distinct over the art of record.

The Examiner also provided a basis of rejection of each of the pending dependent claims. Applicant believes these claims depend from otherwise allowable claims. Applicant has amended claims 7, 11, 12, 13, and 14 to comport with the amendments to claim 1 from which these claims depend. Although Applicant believes claims 2-15 are patentably distinct over the art of record pursuant to the chain of dependency as depending from an otherwise allowable claim, Applicant offers the following points of clarification with respect to the Examiner's rejection of these claims. Specifically, the Examiner takes several liberties with the proffered interpretation of what is disclosed in the art of record.

For example, with respect to claim 11, the Examiner maintains that "Stevens discloses the high-power quick connector assembly further comprising at least one shoulder (1st thread of 30) extending about the shank end (of 30) of the stem portion (30) of the first connector (12)." There is no reasonable basis to conclude that a person of ordinary skill in the art would interpret the element of "at least one shoulder" as defined in claim 11 as the first thread of a threaded segment when the claim also calls for a threaded segment. The Examiner applies a comparable interpretation to the "groove" recited in claim 12. The

Bankstahl, Herbert A.

S/N: 10/711,475

connector of Stevens is clearly threaded along the entire length of the non-truncated portions of the reduced diameter portion 30 of the connector thereof. To interpret the shoulder called for in claim 11 and the groove called for in claim 12 as the initial threading of the corresponding parts is beyond a reasonable interpretation of those limitations, particularly when the claims also call for corresponding threaded portions/segments.

The Examiner also rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevens in view of Double and further in view of Pope or Cusick et al. stating that "Pope teaches a threaded hole (71) is formed in the collar of the first connector (22) (figure 2 of Pole) or the thread hole with the thread (adjacent to reference numeral 14) (figure 1 of EP241121)." Claim 5 calls for, in part, a plurality of threaded holes formed in the collar portion of the first connector which is further defined in claim 1 as having the stem portion. Pope discloses that the pins 71 are inserted into a bore and provide *an immovable pinned connection between the sleeves and connectors*. Col. 3, ln. 74 to col. 4, ln. 2. Simply, Pope does not disclose that which the Examiner alleges is disclosed therein. Similarly, as shown in Fig. 1 of Cusick et al., Cusick et al. does not disclose, suggest, or teach a plurality of threaded holes formed in the collar portion of the connector having the stem portion as called for in claim 5. The Examiner has expanded the interpretation of the references beyond that which is disclosed therein in an effort to satisfy the limitations of the claims. Such an interpretation is only the result of impermissible hindsight. As previously stated, Applicant believes the dependent claims of the present Application are patentably distinct over the art of record at least pursuant to the chain of dependency as depending from claims otherwise believed to be in condition for allowance.

Therefore, in light of at least the foregoing, Applicant respectfully believes that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Furthermore, as the Examiner identified claim 1 as generic in the Restriction Requirement of August 11, 2005, minimally, Applicant requests rejoinder of all of the claims which depend from claim 1. Furthermore, even through the Examiner has identified claim 109 as directed to a non-illustrated "specie 8" and further alleges that "specie 2 does not have a stud", claim 109 depends from claim 106 which is included with alleged "specie 2". Claim 109 does not call for a stud. The basis of the Examiner's species restriction is unsupportable. As argued above, a restriction premised on claims as species is unsupportable. Accordingly, Applicant also requests rejoinder of all pending claims.

Bankstahl, Herbert A.

S/N: 10/711,475

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's consideration of these Amendments and Remarks and cordially invites the Examiner to call the undersigned, should the Examiner consider any matters unresolved.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kirk L. Deheck/

Kirk L. Deheck
Registration No. 55,782
Phone 262-376-5170 ext. 16
kld@zpspatents.com

Dated: February 23, 2006.
Attorney Docket No.: ITW7510.088

P.O. ADDRESS:
Ziolkowski Patent Solutions Group, SC
14135 North Cedarburg Road
Mequon, WI 53097-1416
262-376-5170